DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 568 SP 033 323

AUTHOR Brainard, Frank
TITLE Professional Development Schools: Status As of 1989. Occasional Paper No. 9.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Dec 89
NOTE 63p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Literature Reviews; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teaching; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Holmes Group; *Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

This study examined the progress made toward restructuring teacher education in exemplary school settings or professional development schools (PDS). The report is divided into 5 parts: (1) a review of recent PDS-related literature; (2) a description of the study methodology, including interview protocol design, and the sites selected for consideration; (3) an analysis of general program characteristics; (4) a presentation of the 14 criteria or necessary elements of a PDS and an analysis of the data; and (5) a brief commentary on the findings. Of the 21 settings included in this study, 20 of the universities involved are either members of the Holmes Group or are Ford Foundation grant recipients for the development of PDSs. The findings and conclusions suggest that efforts to establish a PDS are hampered by two factors: inadequate resources and inadequately anticipated obstacles. None of the projects studied appears to meet all or even most of the 14 established criteria; only a few came close to meeting even a few of the criteria. An appendix provides the interview protocol and a brief bibliography. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED338568

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Center for Educational Renewal

Professional Development Schools: Status as of 1989

Frank Brainard

Occasional Paper No. 9

December 1989

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John I. Goodlad
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033323

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		i
Introduction		1
Part I:	Review of the Literature	3
Part II:	Methodology	16
	Interview Protocol Design	16
	Survey Population	18
Part III:	General Program Characteristics	19
	Tables 3.1 - 3.10	23
Part IV:	Fourteen Conditions and Associated Data	27
	Tables 4.1 - 4.13	35
Part V:	Commentary	43
Appendix A:	Interview Protocol	46
Bibliography		51

PREFACE

The Center for Educational Renewal has been engaged since its founding in September, 1985, in developing and promoting the concept of close collaboration of schools and universities in the context of a partnership agreement. Over a dozen school-university partnerships constitute the National Network for Educational Renewal sponsored by the Center. The intent from the beginning has been to tie the renewal of schools to the renewal of preparation programs for those who work in them. Consequently, the development of professional development schools for this purpose is of great interest to all of us in the Center and to our colleagues in the National Network of school-university partnerships.

"Partner schools" is the term most commonly used in these partnerships for schools already being used or about to be used as "practice" settings for the education of educators. The basic concepts included dovetail with those promulgated in proposals for similar schools of varied nomenclature: professional development schools, key schools, clinical schools, and practice schools, to name a few. The need for such schools in seeking to improve teacher education has surfaced in several reform reports appearing in recent years.

I asked Frank Brainard, during a period of his employment in the Center, to take a look at the status of what had all the earmarks of a "movement"--high visibility in reform reports, repeated references at educational meetings, articles in journals, and the like. Are such schools proliferating? What is their mission? What is the nature of collaborative agreements between universities and school districts? What are the funding arrangements?

Brainard took my short list and expanded it. His list of ten provided the basis for interviews with persons closely connected with the 21 settings he identified as sufficiently promising to warrant investigation. The small size of the sample identified is in itself sobering. Brainard used a variety of cross-checking procedures in arriving at this selection. It is important to remember that his was not an attempt to develop a random or even a representative sample of partner or professional development schools in the United States. His effort was designed to secure leads from others who are well positioned to know about such ventures.

The number that emerged suggests that the development of such schools falls somewhat short of a movement! We have no way of knowing how many partner schools he missed. But even if he missed half of those appearing to meet his initial criteria, we are talking about only enough professional

development schools to take care of the annual output of teachers from only one or two preparation programs of moderate size. The rhetoric clearly outruns the reality by substantial proportions.

Drawing primarily from the growing body of writing on the subject, Brainard drew up a list of 14 necessary but reasonable conditions partner schools should meet if they are to become both models of practice and exemplary settings for future teachers to become reflective beginning professionals. Once again, his conclusions are sobering. None met them all or came close to meeting all. Few had established even several of his necessary conditions at an encouraging level. Indeed, many of the settings appeared merely to be perpetuating the circumstances they presumably were designed to correct. To date, the development of professional development schools comes close to being a non-event.

This conclusion is not an indictment of the effort or of those in the vanguard of advancing it. Rather, it should caution us about assuming that progress toward the restructuring of teacher education in exemplary school settings is well advanced. And it should press upon us the fact that this long-overdue development will occur, if at all, only if undertaken with great seriousness and an enormous commitment of time and energy--and additional money.

Frank Brainard's findings and conclusions add to those of other inquiries in suggesting two sobering characteristics of many efforts to effect educational change. First, it is done "on the cheap"--that is, the goodness of the mission is called upon to substitute for the lack of resources. Second, the obstacles are inadequately anticipated. The result of these two limitations working together is that disillusionment often sets in. It is difficult to get resources for work already started, especially if the obstacles are now showing up. And with obstacles becoming more apparent, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the enthusiasm of workers who selflessly added the new project to a schedule already filled. Too often, the crushing conclusion is: "We tried that and it didn't work"--when "it" didn't have a chance from the beginning. The educational landscape is littered with good ideas wounded or killed off in this fashion.

The concept of exemplary schools being used for the induction of future teachers makes good sense. It is an idea whose time is come. The pioneers in the few professional development or partner schools existing or in embryonic stages of development need all the support and encouragement they can get. Part of this support comes from recognizing that additional teachers must be added to these schools to relieve those who add to their load the education of neophytes. Another part involves revising the university reward system so that the teacher education faculty is recognized for its

involvement and is relieved of other responsibilities. The proper development and use of professional development schools involves fundamental re-design of the teacher education enterprise as well as the re-design of schools. This is central, not peripheral, business requiring a fundamental realignment of the cultures of both schools and universities. This must be recognized by policy makers, funding agencies, university and school administrators, teacher, deans, and professors.

Occasional Paper No. 9 is one in a series published by the Center for Educational Renewal since 1986. It follows from Occasional Paper No. 7, which addressed the school-university collaborative context favorable to the creation and subsequent well-being of partner schools. Occasional Paper No. 10 examines some of the financing and governance issues emerging from the findings reported in Paper No. 9. Frank Brainard's contribution to our understanding of the theme of these three papers is timely and useful.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director
Center for Educational Renewal
December 1989

INTRODUCTION

As stated in the preface, the Study of the Education of Educators represents a commitment to examine current conditions with regard to the preparation of teachers for our nation's schools. This occasional paper augments the study by examining one element of teacher education: Professional Development Schools (PDSs).

The examination reported here was guided by five questions regarding the partnerships between schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) and districts in restructuring teacher education through the PDS concept:

1) What does the current literature have to say about the concept of PDSs? Is this concept one that may gain nationwide support?
2) How many PDSs are currently in operation?
3) Is there a commonly accepted philosophy with regard to PDSs?
4) What is the extent of cooperation between SCDEs, districts, and unions? Is there support for PDSs among teachers and administrators not involved in PDS programs?
5) What impact will PDSs have on restructuring teacher education and the concept of practice teaching?

In order to provide responses to these questions, data were obtained by means of interviews conducted with current and prospective professional development school personnel. Fourteen conditions delineating critical elements of a PDS were developed by the author; these conditions guided interview protocol design and data analysis.

The report is divided into 5 parts. Part I presents a review of recent literature regarding the subject of PDSs. Part II presents a description of the study methodology, including interview protocol design, and the sites selected for consideration. Part III presents an analysis of general program characteristics. Part IV is a presentation of the 14 conditions and associated questions, and an analysis of the data. Part V presents a brief commentary.

PART I

Review of the Literature

The idea of the Professional Development School, rooted in the tradition of practice teaching that originated at least 400 years ago, has evolved from recent efforts toward educational reform which have been detailed in proposals made by several national commissions. The purpose of this literature review is to describe the various specific recommendations which have been made with reference to the PDS concept, focusing on the critical nexus between pre-service and in-service teaching, and to present the background for the postulates upon which this research report is based.

In early 15th century England at William Byngham's Godshouse College, a rudimentary form of practice teaching took place (Armytage, 1951). Schoolmasters-to-be had to produce lessons for their fellow classmates and have them critiqued by the headmaster. Much later, in the early 1800s, Rev. Samuel R. Hall established a program wherein pre-service teachers practice-taught in schools (Cubberley, 1919). A few years later Horace Mann, utilizing Hall's idea, established the Model School as part of the first Normal School (Katz,

1968). In the Model School, pre-service teachers observed teachers and children and practice-taught. The idea of placing student teachers in the field as part of their pre-service training, although slow in evolving, nevertheless caught on and became "de rigueur" in the process of teaching teachers to teach.

Those who heeded the call to teach came from all walks of life. Some had college degrees, most did not; some were willing to dedicate their lives to teaching, some merely taught because it was a way to make a living or because they were in a school board members's debt; and, most teachers were women (Tyack, 1967, 1987).

While they may have come to teaching for a variety of reasons, participants in teacher education programs have received essentially the same type of training since the latter 1800's. In most schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) pre-service teachers are expected to sit through methods courses before they are exposed to what children really do in classrooms, then they are handed over to a teacher in a school who will "mentor" to them for a period of time that ranges from several weeks to a school year (Schubert, 1986).

Recently, as a part of a general movement toward educational reform, a number of proposals have been made with

reference to the preparation of teachers. Following is a brief consideration of these several proposals.

In 1983, Elsie W. Gee proposed the establishment of Teacher Education Academies. The academies would provide programs for in-service staff development, pre-service teacher education, and student teaching. In some instances, academy staff would have joint appointments with SCDEs. All academies would serve as sites for research and development projects. Incorporated into a network, the Academies would provide communication opportunities to reduce isolation and share knowledge gained through research and development and actual classroom experiences.

Focussing on elementary education, these Academies would bring to a conscious level, in pre-service and in-service teachers, an understanding "...of classroom effectiveness research; engage in collaborative inquiry; identify the present and future staffing criteria and staff development priorities of cooperating school districts; analyze classroom instruction; and apply instructional research to classroom instructional problems" (1983, p 2).

A call for action with regard to a new kind of teacher training institution was sounded in 1986 by the Holmes Group report, Tomorrow's Teachers. The report recommends: 1) the development of a three-tiered career ladder system for

teachers; 2) improvement of teaching in liberal arts courses; 3) changing methods courses to courses designed to teach principles of pedagogy specific to a subject matter field; 4) real collaboration between schools and SCDEs; 5) abolition of undergraduate majors in education; and 6) establishment of PDSs.

Like the Lab School concept developed by Dewey and the Key School concept envisioned by Goodlad, the PDSs are to be sites for experimentation in education, centers for the development of good teaching practices, and for the training of pre-service teachers. There is to be a strong collaboration between SCDEs and the school districts they serve. Along with this the PDSs are to be centers for student diversity and they are to disseminate information to other schools and teachers (Holmes, 1986).

PDSs are to be staffed by teachers from all three levels of the career ladder: Instructor: BA/BS, no professional training, and no certificate; Professional Teacher: Master's degree in teaching, one full year of supervised teaching experience and certification based on competence as a practioner, knowledge of subject matter, and good evaluations; Career Professional: evidence of continued study beyond the MEd, evidence of superior teaching talent and knowledge of subject matter, completion of requirements for the Professional Teacher's License, and extensive in-

classroom experience. It is reasonable to assume that teachers on the first two rungs of the ladder would work toward Career Professional status, that all staff would devote their time and energy to the teaching of children, and be committed to pre-service teacher education.

The Holmes Group believes in a strong SCDE/School collaboration with research in education as a top priority. Research will be conducted by SCDE faculty, PDS senior faculty, and pre-service and novice teachers. Recognizing that "Competent teachers are important to all students, but [that] they are especially critical for the growing numbers of educationally at-risk children" (p. 31), the Holmes Group model for PDSs not only stresses the importance of student diversity (economically, racially, and intellectually), it makes a commitment, in part, to basing the SCDE/School collaborations on student equity.

Shortly after the publication of Tomorrow's Teachers, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy published A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. This report echoed several of the Holmes Group recommendations, including: 1) no admittance into a professional education program without first attaining a bachelor's degree in a liberal arts or science field; 2) a strong recommendation for a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards which would develop a National Board Certification program;

and 3) SCDEs would offer an MEd oriented toward the professionalization of teaching.

In order to support these changes the report recommends: 4) a two-tiered career ladder with the top job being Lead Teacher status; 5) higher salaries; 6)the elimination of emergency or back-door certification; and 7) Clinical Schools to support inquiry, innovation, and research in education. Clinical School faculties would establish a close collaboration with SCDEs and arts and sciences faculties to explore new instructional practices. By working closely together, the Carnegie report says, they may produce the best possible experience for pre-service teachers.

The Carnegie Report makes recommendations to upgrade the profession. The report stresses the need for higher salaries, more attention to minority recruitment, and doing away with top-down decision making. The authors recognize that the "essential source of good schools is already in the schools" (p 75) and that school people should recognize that they have the same knowledge of practice and good judgement displayed by other professions. Consequently, they should not keep to the practice of relying on "experts", consultants, administrators, etc. to tell them what is the right thing to do in schools.

The Carnegie Forum believes that teacher preparation should be an intensive two year program that follows this outline:

Previous to Year One: full-time summer course work in basic pedagogy.

Year One: part-time course work and an internship that includes some practice teaching.

full-time summer course work that builds on the internship.

Year Two: During the school year, course work as needed.

Full-time residency that includes substantial teaching responsibilities under the supervision of a Lead Teacher.

Upon completion of the program, the student will have an MEd and qualify for state certification.

Clinical Schools, as envisioned by the Carnegie Forum, will play an increasingly important role in teacher renewal and teacher preparation and will "exemplify the collegial, performance-oriented environment(s) that newly certified teachers should be prepared to establish" (p. 76).

The report states that the new MEd program "prepares candidates to become competent teachers and pass the assessment procedures required for board certification" (p. 76). One would hope that there are additional criteria for evaluating candidates so as to avoid merely "teaching to the test".

Similar to PDS and Clinical Schools is the concept of Induction Schools recommended by Arthur E. Wise and others in a 1987 Rand Corporation monograph, Effective Teacher Selection: From Recruitment to Retention. Although the main priority of Induction Schools is the induction of novice teachers into the profession, there are implications for pre-service teachers. Wise, et al., believe that difficult schools too often lose good, senior teachers to more attractive assignments, leaving the least advantaged children to be taught by novices or substitutes. They recommend re-identifying the "difficult schools" as Induction Schools and, in the process, establishing a means by which many pressing problems can be addressed such as: how to socialize new teachers into the profession and offer them the best supervision; how to make the job of teaching in difficult schools more attractive; and how to give pre-service teachers experience in inner-city and rural areas and still offer them excellent teachers under which to train. By 1992 inner-city and rural schools, which can also often be categorized as

"difficult schools" (high student attrition, hard to teach children, little-to-no community support, and high teacher turnover), will be hardest hit by the fact that only two-thirds of the available teaching positions will be filled. Induction School status may offer a vehicle to change this negative image to "good schools". Wise, et al., offer several recommendations regarding this change: higher salaries for teachers in Induction Schools; alter working conditions to make the school a more attractive employment opportunity; overstaff with teacher aides who will take over some of the extra-curricular responsibilities; recognize teachers' talents and experience by offering teaching assignments that reflect that respect; and broader responsibilities, eg., teacher selection, curricular decision making, etc.

If the goal of Induction Schools is to induct novice teachers into the profession, then they can also offer pre-service teachers an excellent way to learn from expert teachers, observe novice teachers entry into teaching, work with both groups and SCDE faculty to develop and hone their skills in inquiry and reflection on practice, gain broader experience with a diverse student population, and learn how to make judgments and decisions with regard to what and how students are to be taught. This may allow pre-service teachers to begin to operate as independent professionals.

If the theories behind Induction Schools can be put into practice, they may become environments which "can create the possibility that entry to teaching will be sufficiently selective and well-supported to sustain a teaching force that will capture public confidence and will enable genuine educational reform" (p. 96).

In 1988 the American Federation of Teachers published a monograph entitled Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model. Central to the paper is the definition of the mission of the PDSs: support of student success; providing a locus for pre-service teaching programs; and support of systematic inquiry into the improvement of practice. In a shorter piece which is included in the monograph, Levine and Gendler elaborate on the three elements of the PDSs' mission and point out that PDSs can become an inextricable part of school restructuring and possible vehicles for the professionalization of teaching. In their view, PDSs "can have the same impact on teaching that teaching hospitals had on medicine" and "can become the institutional base of authority for the profession" (p. 29). This can be accomplished by focusing attention on the salient aspects of the profession: 1) a clear knowledge base; 2) collegiality; and 3) a systematic induction program.

Unlike the Rand Corporation study which concentrates on the induction of first year teachers into the teaching

profession, the AFT monograph stresses the induction of pre-service teachers. Another crucial element in teacher education which is emphasized in the monograph is the necessity for teachers to reflect on their practice in the course of their training.

In the November, 1988 issue of Educational Leadership, Phillip Schlechty, Donald Ingwerson, and Terry Brook discuss a long-term plan for "Inventing Professional Development Schools". Central to their report is the idea of the PDS as part of an overall restructuring of teacher education, the teaching profession, school organization and management, and public school/SCDE relationships. They have developed a mission for PDSs that includes a demand for the schools and the SCDEs to: develop a philosophy and set of standards for exemplary schools, identify an effective means to assess schools in light of that philosophical statement and those standards, design in-service training to assure teachers and administrators understand the mission, and set the means to the end of carrying out the mission of the PDSs. Schlechty, Ingwerson and Brooks sponsored a discussion among 104 teachers, administrators, and SCDE faculty who agreed that "The PDSs would become places where every leader is a teacher, every teacher is a leader, and every student is a success" (p.31). This statement agrees with the view of children exemplified in their expression that students must

be active participants in their education and not just intellectual pitchers, sitting passively waiting to be filled up with information.

Jane Stallings and Theodore Kowalski have recently completed a chapter in the 1990 edition of the Handbook of Research in Teacher Education (in press). Much of their research focuses on two precursors to PDSs, Lab schools and Portal schools. In addition, they mention a number of schools that are utilizing different models for preparing pre-service teachers and renewing in-service teachers.

Stallings and Kowalski cite three institutions that offer programs for in-service teachers: Yale, Oberlin, and the University of Maryland at College Park. Yale focuses primarily on teacher renewal and curriculum development. Oberlin's purpose is to make the resources of the college available to secondary teachers in the Cleveland area through workshops that offer college credit. The University of Maryland offers teaching assistantships to math/science teachers in Montgomery County public schools. The university also offers a program for SCDE faculty, cooperating teachers, and principals to analyze, develop, and put into practice ideas that will facilitate good field experiences in the pre-service teacher training program.

In regard to the development of PDSs, Stallings and Kowalski cite seven SCDEs that have pre-service training models in place that present some types of PDSs:

1. The University of Oregon combines graduate study with one year of full-time resident teaching. Although not a pre-service program, it does provide the first year teacher with support from the SCDE and school district.
2. The University of Wisconsin at White Water incorporates a team approach in its pre-service field training. The team consists of an SCDE consultant, building administrator, one cooperating teacher, and the intern.
3. Northern Arizona University provides a field experience for junior and senior education majors. This pre-student teaching program gives students a chance to determine if teaching is really for them.
4. Cleveland State University trains in-service teachers to be Classroom Teacher Educators. These teachers contract with the SCDE to supervise pre-service teachers all year and "function as resource teachers to other teachers in their building who have field experience students".
5. The University of Maryland established teacher education centers in the 1960s to focus on pre-service and in-service professional development. A major component is the support of action research by interns and cooperating teachers. This

type of activity tends to give the interns and the cooperating teachers time to reflect on their practice.

6. In an effort to "support the concept of teacher education as an ongoing developmental process", Virginia Commonwealth University developed the Collaborative Teacher Education Program. In this program a student moves from pre-service to certified status and works only with cooperating teachers who have gone through VCUs Mentor-Lead Teacher program.

7. The University of Houston, in collaboration with the Houston ISD, developed the Houston Teaching Academy. This program shares many aspects of the others cited by Stallings and Kowalski but has the additional focus of the preparation and renewal of teachers for the revitalization of inner-city schools.

One must wonder about the Stallings/Kowalski definition of a PDS, since the existence of such does not come through in any of the above examples.

PART II

Methodology

It was evident in a review of the literature that a number of elements have been recommended as necessary in the development of PDSs. By translating those elements into a set of necessary conditions which served as the basis for a survey questionnaire, it became possible to interview informants (deans of education schools, project administrators, and teachers in the field) by telephone to determine what is currently occurring in professional development schools.

Most of the questions on the telephone survey were answered by administrative personnel, largely because of the time of year when the study was conducted (summer, 1989).

Design of the Interview Protocol

The interview protocol (see Appendix A) was designed and revised to gain information on the set of conditions that were believed to be integral to establishing and maintaining a PDS project. During the development of the questions, items were added, deleted, or re-worded in order to gain maximum information with minimum time and stress on the part of the informants. The most difficult terms to define and on which

to come to agreement with the informants in order to establish a common language were " Professional Development Schools" and "Interns". To some informants, interns were induction level teachers and to others, interns were student teachers. There are several terms used throughout the literature and in common usage for centers in which to train pre-service teachers: professional development schools or centers, professional practice schools, induction schools, practice teaching centers, clinical practice schools or centers, teacher education academies, and field experience centers. For the purposes of this study Professional Development Schools and interns are the terms that have been used.

In the first section of the questionaire, general information on the SCDE/district partnerships was collected. This information created a base from which to make comparisons. The questions in the balance of the questionnaire are broken into sections that correspond with the conditions. In some instances, one question addressed one condition; in others, two or more questions were used for one condition. For example, condition number six required only one question, while two questions were used for condition number seven. Initially it was expected that forty minutes would be the time necessary to get through an interview. In fact, anywhere from fifty minutes to one hour

and forty-five minutes were required for the interviews. The average time was a little over one hour.

Several respondents followed up the telephone interviews with written material that further explained their projects.

Survey Population

Selected authorities in the field contributed names of institutions they believed had or would soon have PDS sites in operation. They were chosen from the following geographical areas: from the North--3; Northeast--2; Mid-Atlantic--3; Central--5; South--4; Southwest--3; and West--5. Of the 25 suggested, it was soon determined that 1 had absolutely no plans to engage in a PDS and 3 were only in the preliminary stages of considering such a project.

Of the 21 settings used in this study, 20 of the universities involved are either members of the Holmes Group or are Ford Foundation grant recipients. One SCDE/district partnership which was identified through another research project has no ties to either group. Three of the 21 respondent programs are district initiated and work with more than one SCDE in their area and maintain fairly tight control over the project.

PART III

General Program Characteristics

Ten questions (Appendix A 1-10) regarding the general characteristics of individual PDS projects resulted in the following data:

1. Current Status. Two partnerships have PDS projects that have been in operation for 10 years; one has been in operation for 2 years; and 3 were established in the fall of 1988. Of those now being planned, 6 expect to be in operation in the fall of 1989, one in the fall of 1990; eight have not yet set a time for having a project in place. (See table 3.1) This last group expects to have this information crystalized by the fall of 1989.

2. Pre-service teachers served by the PDSs. When asked what is or will be the planned number of interns served per school per year there was a wide range of responses. About 50% of the respondents expect anywhere from 11 to 50 interns to go through their programs per year. Table 3.2 presents data pertaining to intern numbers.

3. Special Requirements for Admission of Interns. SCDEs and Districts were asked if there are any special requirements made of interns before they are admitted into the program. Two of the programs that have PDSs in operation require 5th year status in the SCDE before entry into the program as do 4 of the projects that are in the planning stages. Other programs require students to answer special questionaires, to meet requirements for job descriptions set up for interns, or to have completed a certain number of courses in pedagogy. Table 3.3 presents these data.

4. Program Responsibility. Responsibilty for the curricular and logistical aspects of the PDSs runs the gamut from projects that share the responsibility to those that have not yet determined which entity will "run the show". Table 3.4 presents how responsibility is allocated. The data corresponds with postulate #4.

5. Teacher Certification. Another aspect of program responsibility is the determination of which entity will recommend interns for teacher certification. Will it be shared or not? Eight of the respondents reported that the universities do not share this responsibility with the districts. Although this is less than half of the respondents, it must be noted that 8 of them have not yet

decided this issue. Table 3.5 presents how this is taking shape.

6. State Support. When queried if the state superintendent of public instruction (SPI) had relaxed any of the state requirements in order to facilitate the establishment of a PDS project, only one of the planned projects answered affirmatively. Fourteen programs report that the SPI has made no move to help. In 6 of the programs it has not yet been decided. Table 3.6 demonstrates the break-down.

7. Union/Faculty Association Cooperation. Overall, barely a majority of the respondents report that Union/faculty association participation and cooperation is good from the planning stages on. They also believe that the nature of this cooperation will not change due, in part, to early involvement of the unions in the planning process. With 3 of the programs, the union/faculty associations have not yet determined how they will or if they will be involved. Data pertaining to this topic is presented in table 3.7.

8. Peer Relationships. Respondents were asked to consider if their relationships with their peers and with administrators who are not involved with the PDS program had changed in any way since the program began. Fifty-two

percent of the respondents believe that their peers and administrators who are not involved in the PDS program view it in a positive light and are supportive. Forty-eight percent are experiencing mixed emotions regarding this topic. With the latter, the range of responses is from those who are experiencing some form of rejection from peers and administrators not in the program to those who are seen as just part of another attempt to change things. The implication here is that the program really will make no difference in teacher training. Table 3.8 presents data pertaining to peer relationships.

9. In-service Classload. In table 3.9 one can see that in all but one of the respondent PDSs teachers carry a full teaching load in addition to the work they encounter as intern mentors.

10. SCDE Collaboration. Collaboration between the SCDEs and the districts with regard to the PDSs is presented in table 3.10. Seven programs believe they have a strong collaboration, 8 respond that it is good, and only 1 claims a fair relationship. The rest have not yet determined at what level they will collaborate on the project.

Tables 3.1 to 3.10 follow this section. The A group is made up of respondents claiming to have PDSs in operation; the B group is made up of those reporting programs that are still in the planning stages.

TABLES

General Respondent Characteristics

Table 3.1
Current Status of PDS Programs

In Operation (A Group)	6
Planning Stages (B Group)	15

Table 3.2

Pre-service Teachers served by the PDS

	A	B
1-10		2
11-25	2	3
26-50	1	4
51-100	1	1
101-200	2	2
201-plus		1
Not Yet Determined(NYD)		2

Table 3.3

PDS Intern Admission Requirements

	A	B
Special Requirements Necessary	2	5
Special Requirements Unnecessary	4	9
Requirements NYD		1

Table 3.4

Curriculum and Logistical Responsibility

	A	B
Responsibility shared between SCDE and district	2	5
Responsibility resides solely with the district		2
Responsibility resides solely with the SCDE	3	3
Responsibility NYD	1	5

Table 3.5

Responsibility for Certification recommendation

	A	B
Responsiblilty shared between the SCDE and district		1
Responsibility resides solely with the district		
Responsibility resides solely with the SCDE	3	5
SCDEs seeking to turn over control to the district	1	3
NYD	2	6

Table 3.6

SPI Support

	A	B
State requirements relaxed	1	
State requirements not relaxed	4	10
NYD	2	4

Table 3.7

Union/Faculty Association involvement

	A	B
Good involvement	4	8
Fair involvement		2
No involvement	1	3
NYD	1	2

Table 3.8

Peer Relationships

	A	B
Relationships remain unchanged	4	7
Relationships have changed	2	8

Table 3.9

In-Service Class Load Requirements

	A	B
Full time	6	14
Part time		1

Table 3.10

SCDE/district collaboration

	A	B
Strong	2	5
Good	2	6
Fair	1	
NYD	1	4

PART IV

Fourteen Conditions and Associated Data

As indicated above, fourteen conditions delineating necessary elements of a Professional Development School were developed early on to provide the framework for the study. Following are the conditions, along with data summaries bearing on each of the fourteen.

Condition 1. Professional Development Schools must be autonomous, with the capability to set policy and establish guidelines separately from the school district.

---- In our sampling, one of the programs in the A group and 4 of the programs in the B group claim the autonomy to set policy and guidelines separately from the local district and to do so in a setting that is self-contained. The balance of the programs share space with schools in the district. For the most part, they are regarded as additional programs under the aegis of the parent school administration. (see table 4.1 and question 11 (appendix A))

Condition 2. PDSs must represent all age levels, elementary through high school. Focussing attention on only one level of schools is antithetical to the concept of restructuring teacher education; children at all levels of development must be served.

---- The grade configuration of each project as presented in table 4.2 reveals that there is a broad range of school levels among the respondent projects. (see question 12)

Condition 3. PDSs must have access to unrestricted, long-term, protected funding. No PDS project can get off the ground with just one year's funding. Generally speaking, it takes at least one year to plan for such a far reaching venture, another to get it in practice, another to iron out the problems that surface in the first year of operation, and two more years to establish an evaluation process. It is also a major problem or obstacle to have to re-apply for funding year after year. Consequently, unrestricted and long-term protected funds are essential and the responsibility for raising and managing those funds should be shared by the SCDEs and the school districts.

---- Unrestricted, protected funding and shared responsibility for funding projects is not yet a priority. In fact, all of the programs in the A group fall into the not-shared category, and of them, only 1 has long-term, protected funding. Of the programs in the B group, 5 will share financial responsibility between the districts and the SCDEs. Table 4.3 shows that six programs will not share financial responsibility and 4 suffer from the knowledge that their funding is in a state of limbo. Only 2 of the B group have protected funding. (see question 13)

Condition 4. Responsibility and accountability for the curricular and logistical elements of the PDSs must be shared by the SCDEs and the districts.

(See "Respondent Characteristics", Question No. 4)

Condition 5. PDSs must prepare interns to work with a diverse population that includes "at risk" students. The population of the PDSs must reflect changing demographics in

order to give interns an overall picture of the student population. Care must be taken with PDS admission policies to ensure a thorough cross section of abilities, SES, sex, and race. Diversity cannot be limited to the student population. Every effort must be made to recruit a cross section of teachers with regard to race, sex, and age.

---- The issue of diversity in student and faculty populations is a mixed bag. The majority of the programs (4 of the A group and 10 of the B group) have made it a priority to ensure a good cross section of students, with the primary variable being racial diversity. For 2 of the A programs and 2 of the B programs diversity is not a priority. Three of the B sites have either not yet determined how this issue will be addressed or have not yet selected all of the PDS sites.

Even though all respondents are actively involved in identifying and recruiting minority teachers into their programs, they still are experiencing a great deal of difficulty actually hiring minorities. Table 4.4 reveals how diversity is broken out in both groups.

Respondents were asked if they thought interns would be prepared to teach in a variety of settings or would they be limited to teaching only one group of children. One program (a B respondent) believed their teachers would not be prepared for a variety of settings. In 5 of the respondent groups, not all sites not yet been selected; however, their aim is to see to it that the interns are well prepared to teach in both urban and suburban settings. Table 4.4 also

presents data pertaining to diversity of settings. (see questions 14, 15)

Condition 6. PDSs must not engage in tracking students. All students must be provided with equity in education.

---- With regard to tracking, it is clear that it exists in PDS programs. Thirteen of the respondents say tracking is part of the district policy. In the PDS programs that claim autonomy, tracking is entrenched although the respondents are very critical of the practice and are doing all they can to eliminate it. Eight of the respondents either did not/could not answer the question or simply did not know the status of this issue. (see table 4.5 and question 16)

Condition 7. All professional staff must be committed to and involved in the process of teaching teachers, the idea of changing teacher education, and restructuring schools. Teachers employed in the PDS must be involved in the decision making processes that affect their teaching, e.g., curriculum, text book selection, hiring administrators, selecting interns, etc. Interns in these schools must be given a realistic understanding of what it means to be an educator. It is necessary, therefore, that they become involved in all aspects of a school, from building and grounds to curriculum and administration.

---- The data do not give a clear picture of how in-service teachers are or will be involved in the day-to-day operation of the school or in the selection of administrators; however, they are and will be involved in selecting interns and setting curricula. It is interesting to note that all but one of the sites are involved in a restructuring project, yet only 2 of the A group and 5 of the B group use a team

approach to dealing with interns. The majority of the rest cling to the idea of one-to-one, cooperating teacher to intern. (see table 4.6 and question 17, 18)

Condition 8. PDSs must be environments where an atmosphere of experimentation prevails. The SCDE and PDS faculties must be seen as initiators of new teaching practices committed to the investigation and research necessary to keep their respective schools on the cutting edge of new, innovative educational practices.

---- Data pertaining to the issue of research in education is presented in table 4.7. As indicated in this table, 9 programs allot time in their schedules for teachers to engage in research and development, 5 do not, and 7 have not yet decided whether or not to prioritize this. (see question 19)

Condition 9. Time and resources must be built into the weekly schedule to give cooperating teachers and interns a chance to reflect on and to engage in critical analysis of their practices. Whether by overstaffing, lengthening the school year, team teaching, or making creative use of volunteers and interns, schedules must be adjusted to allow for effective teacher contact time with the children, time to engage in analysis with peers regarding the improvement of the art and practice of teaching, and time to help the interns reflect on their fledgling practice.

---- Reflection upon practice for SCDE and PDS faculty and the interns is not yet a priority. As presented in table 4.8, six programs (1 A and 5 B), however, are attempting to change this by enriching their staffing formulae to give in-service teachers occasional time off to reflect on practice. Table 4.8 is also a presentation of programs that allow time for in-service teacher/intern analysis of the intern's work

in the classroom. As is evident, 3 programs have set up time for the teachers to work with interns other than on-the-fly meetings held during recess, breaks between classes, or lunch periods. The respondents believe that eventually this will change so that time will be scheduled for this purpose during the school day. (see questions 20, 21)

Condition 10. PDSs faculty, interns, and SCDE faculty must meet on a regular basis. Occasional, brief, on-the-fly meetings between cooperating teachers and interns and even fewer visits from SCDE supervising teachers must cease.

-----As indicated in table 4.9, the majority of the SCDE faculty see their involvement in PDS programs as a positive thing, yet this table also indicates that there is no majority agreement as to the importance of meeting with PDS faculty and interns on a regular basis. (see question 22, 23)

Condition 11. PDSs should serve as extended classrooms of the SCDEs. Not all learning occurs in a classroom, neither should all courses for pre-service teachers be taught at the SCDE. There must be a concentrated effort on the part of the SCDE faculty to teach courses in the PDS. By doing so, people involved with the PDS will see it as an important link to the SCDE. Some courses must be taught by the PDS faculty and teachers from throughout the district. Others should be team taught with SCDE faculty.

---- Table 4.10 indicates that a clear majority believes that all pre-service teachers ultimately will be trained in PDSs and that pre-service education courses should be taught in the PDSs. Twelve of the programs also regard the idea of PDS

faculty teaching pre-service courses in a positive light. (see questions 24, 25, 26)

Condition 12. A clear system of rewards must be in place for faculties of the PDS and the SCDEs. An atmosphere must be created in the PDS wherein teachers can advance their careers without leaving the classroom. Rewards may take the form of faculty positions at the SCDE, higher salaries, release time, or more prestige. SCDE faculty who work with a PDS will spend a significant amount of their time working with interns and cooperating teachers and being in schools. They must have the assurance that involvement in the PDS and teacher education in general will not lead to oblivion in the form of reduced prestige, being placed on a non-tenure track, or receiving less salary.

---- Table 4.11 presents data pertaining to the reward systems set up for PDS and SCDE faculties. For PDS faculty, the rewards are: adjunct faculty status at the SCDE, higher salaries, college credit or stipends, more prestige, and release time. For SCDE faculty, the rewards are: tenure track status, reduced class load in order to conduct research, and increased situations which offer opportunities to conduct research. It should be noted that.most of the SCDE respondents remarked, that their involvement in the PDS project could very well place them in a position of having less chance to be placed on a tenure track. This is due to the fact that with the increased work load in schools, they will have little time for research and publishing the results of their research. (see question 27)

Condition 13. Theories and practices developed in the PDSs must be shared with other schools and districts. A program such as this is of no use if what is developed is not shared with others. There must be a vehicle in place to disseminate to other teachers the knowledge gained through research and practice. Whatever device is used, be it making the PDS a demonstration school or giving teachers release time to conduct in-service education in other schools, it should be an integral part of the planning process and should be ready to activate before the PDS opens.

---- Expansion of the PDS projects is clearly not yet a priority. Four of the programs have plans to create more projects or to disseminate the knowledge. These data are presented in table 4.12. (see question 28)

Condition 14. A system for evaluating the project must be in place from the outset. Clear goals must be set and a system of project and teacher evaluation must be developed. The evaluation process must begin in the planning stage of the program, be longitudinal in nature, and have resources set aside from the outset to support it.

---- Evaluation, as an on going process, is in place in 3 of the A groups and 10 of the B groups. Data pertaining to evaluation are presented in table 4.13. (see question 29).

Tables 4.1 to 4.13 follow this section.

TABLES

The Fourteen Conditions and Associated Data

Table 4.1

Autonomy to Set Policy

	A	B
Autonomous/self contained	1	4
Part of another school autonomy in question	5	8
NYD		3

Table 4.2

School and Grade Configuration

	A	B
Elementary	1	5
Middle School		1
High School	2	
K-8	1	3
K-12	1	5
Split between Elementary and High School	1	
NYD	1	

Table 4.3

Project Funding

	A	B
Shared with district/protected		
Shared with district/not protected		5
Not shared with district/protected	1	2
Not shared with district/not protected	5	4
Funding in question		4

Table 4.4

Student/Faculty Diversity and Preparation for Teaching in Diverse Settings

		A	B
Student body diverse in all areas			
	yes	4	10
	no	2	2
all sites not yet selected			3

Ability to recruit and hire a diverse faculty	fair	1	6
	poor	5	6
all sites and faculty not yet selected		3	

Interns will be prepared to
teach in a variety of settings

	A	B
yes	4	11
no		1
NYD	2	3

Table 4.5

Tracking

Does the PDS track students?

	A	B
yes	3	10
do not know or no answer	3	5

Table 4.6

Restructuring TEPs

Is the PDS project part of an over-
all restructuring of teacher educa-
tion in the SCDE and district?

	A	B
yes	6	14
no		1

		A	B
Do interns work one-on-one or with a team or cooperating teachers?			
	one-on-one	4	6
	team	2	5
split--only some work with a team			2
	NYD		2

Table 4.7

Research and Development Time Allocation

		A	B
Is or will time be allotted for R&D?			
	yes	2	7
	no	2	3
	NYD	2	5

Table 4.8

Time and Resources Allocation for Reflection on Practice

		A	B
Is the staffing formula enriched for in-service teachers to engage in reflection on practice?			
	yes	1	5
	no	5	8
only in selected grade levels			1
	NYD		1

Is time set aside for critical analysis between cooperating teachers and interns?			
	yes	1	2
no, it is done on-the-fly		2	5
	NYD	2	7
varies from "on the fly" to a set time--dependent upon grade level		1	1

Table 1.9

SCDE Faculty Involvement

		A	B
Is SCDE faculty involvement in the PDS seen as a Positive thing on the part of the SCDE faculty?			
	yes	5	9
	no		2
	NYD	1	4

Do interns meet on a regular basis with SCDE faculty and cooperating teachers?			
	yes	2	4
	no	2	6
	NYD	2	5

Table 4.10

PDSs as Extended Classrooms of the SCDEs

		A	B
Will all teachers eventually be trained in PDSs?	yes	5	9
	no		5
	NYD	1	1
Will pre-service education courses be taught in the PDS?	yes	5	7
	no		3
	NYD	1	5
Does the SCDE faculty believe pre-service courses should be taught by PDS staff?	yes	4	6
	no	1	5
	NYD	1	4

Table 4.11

Reward Systems

	A	B
Is there a system of rewards for SCDE and PDS faculty?		
PDS faculty		
yes	3	4
no	1	4
NYD	2	7
SCDE faculty		
yes		2
no	4	6
NYD	2	7

Table 4.12

Expansion of PDSs

		A	B
Will the PDS program be expanded?	definitely yes	2	2
	definitely no	2	4
	NYD	2	9

Table 4.13

Program Evaluation

		A	B
Are there evaluation plans in place?	yes	3	10
	no	1	5
	NYD	2	

COMMENTARY

We have attempted to answer a few fundamental questions as to what is currently the status of Professional Development Schools. Arguably, more questions may have been raised than have been answered. It is not the purpose of this paper to draw concrete conclusions regarding the future of teacher education or PDSs; evaluations of projects are in place and scholars will continue to conduct research into their efficacy.

It appears that those persons responsible for the majority of the projects in this sampling clearly believe that the restructuring of teacher education is very important and that they have developed plans for PDSs to further this end. Yet, many of the fundamental elements of teaching teachers to teach, some of which have been mentioned in the necessary conditions developed for this paper, appear not to be included in the design and implementation of the current projects.

For example, the majority of in-service teachers' classloads are not adjusted to allow them to have time for personal reflection on practice and critical analysis of interns' work. In addition, most of the projects cling to the practice of the one-to-one cooperating teacher to intern

model, instead of pursuing a team-teaching approach with a cohort group of interns assigned to a school. Why are reflection on practice and a team approach not priorities when current research suggests that they may be extremely beneficial to teacher training?

Regular SCDE faculty interaction with interns and in-service teachers is not yet a priority. Most of what is to be gained from creating a PDS is thus lost. Systems of rewards are not equitable since district faculty receive more recognition than do SCDE faculty. Given this information, one can question the effectiveness and quality of the collaboration between SCDEs and districts. Is strong collaboration not an essential feature of the PDS concept?

The question of funding is of major interest. All of the projects are funded only for the short term. Clearly, there is a willingness on the part of the respondent institutions to expend energy, time, and resources to see that individual PDS projects come to fruition, but how will they be maintained in the long term? From what sources will the PDSs be funded? Most SCDEs will not be able to bear the burden for long-term funding alone and, because of budgetary (and possible union) constraints, the school districts may not be able to, either. In all likelihood, new funding sources may need to be developed in order to see PDS projects established efficiently and quickly and then protected from

loss of funds. Some possible examples are: school/business partnerships such as those undertaken by the schools in Dade County, Florida, tuition payments, long-term foundation funding, or the development of a separate funding umbrella similar to that often enjoyed by vocational schools.

For the most part, respondents were committed to promoting equity in education through recruiting minority teachers and eliminating tracking. In practice, though, they have been able to institute few changes in district policies regarding these issues. How can PDS projects be allowed the flexibility to institute changes which are supported by research and inquiry? If such changes cannot be brought about by those who believe in them, how will they occur?

In summary, none of the projects included in this study appears to meet all or even most of the fourteen criteria we have established for professional development schools. Only a few of the projects come close to meeting even a few of the criteria we have established. To the extent the criteria we have set forth are fair and reasonable expectations of what a good professional development school might be, there remains much to be done.

APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol

General Respondent Characteristics

1. Do you presently have a PDS project in operation? If so, how long has it been in place?
2. How many interns do you serve or hope to serve during a school year?
3. Are there any special requirements expected of students who desire entry into the PDS program?
4. Who has overall responsibility and accountability for the project, the SCDE or the district? Or, is it shared?
5. Who recommends the interns for teacher certification? Is it a cooperative venture between the SCDE and the district?
6. Are any state regulations relaxed or waived to facilitate the operation or development of this project?
7. Is the union or faculty association involved in the PDS project?
8. What do you believe is or will be the level of cooperation between the teachers in the PDS project, their peers, and administrators not involved in the project? In other words, what is the level of support for this restructuring project throughout the district?
9. What is the in-service teachers' class load?
10. How would you characterize the collaboration between the SCDE and the PDS?

Questions Corresponding to Necessary Conditions

Condition #1

11. Is your PDS a school within a school or is it in an autonomous setting removed from the constraints of district rules and regulations?

Condition #2

12. What is the grade configuration of the PDS? Does it follow the usual 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. or is it ungraded?

Condition #3

13. How is the PDS funded, for how long, and are the funds protected?

Condition #4 (see question #4)

Condition #5

14. How would you characterize the student body and faculty in the PDS with regard to diversity in race, sex, SES, and academic ability?

15. When the interns complete their training do you believe they will be able to teach in a variety of settings?

Condition #6

16. Are the students in your PDS tracked?

Condition #7

17. The assumption is that this program is a new or different way to teach teachers to teach. Is this program part of an overall restructuring of your teacher education program?
18. Do the interns work one-on-one with a single cooperating teacher, or do they work with a team of cooperating teachers?

Condition #8

19. Will time be allotted for PDS and SCDE faculty to engage in research and development?

Condition #9

20. Is the staffing formula enriched in any way to meet the needs of this program? For example, do you or will you ovestaff?
21. Will time be set aside for cooperating teachers to engage the interns in critical analysis of their (the interns') work?

Condition #10

22. Is SCDE faculty involvement seen as something positive by the faculty and are they engaged?

23. Do or will the interns meet on a regularly scheduled basis with SCDE faculty and cooperating teachers?

Condition #11

24. Do you envision that ultimately pre-service teachers will be trained only in PDSs?
25. Will or are any Pre-service education courses taught at the PDS?
26. Will or are any pre-service education courses taught by the PDS staff?

Condition #12

27. Is there a system of rewards in place to attract and keep SCDE and PDS faculty involved in the program?

Condition #13

28. Is there or will there be an opportunity for the knowledge gained in the PDS to be disseminated to other venues and for the program to be expanded?

Condition #14

29. Is there or will there be a plan to evaluate the PDS program?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armytage, W.H.G. "William Byngham: A Medieval Protagonist of the Training of Teachers" , History of Education Journal, vol. 12, no. 4, (Summer, 1951):107-110.

Carnegie Forum on Education and The Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the Twentyfirst Century. Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Forum. New York: Author, 1986.

Clifford, Geraldine J. and Guthrie, James W. Ed School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Cubberly, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1919.

Gee, Elsie W. "Applying Research to Teacher Education: Overview of Research Utilization in Elementary Teacher Education". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association. Jackson Hole, WY: October 13-15, 1983.

Goodlad, John. Citizens for the 21st Century. Instruction, Appendix N. Sacramento, CA: State Committee on Public Education, 1969.

--------. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Mich.: Author, 1986.

Katz, Michael B. The Irony of Early School Reform. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Levine, Marsha, Gendler, Tamar, and Darling-Hammond, Linda. Professional Practice Schools. Monograph No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1988.

Oakes, Jeannie. Keeping Track. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985.

Schlechty, Phillip, Ingwerson, Donald, and Brooks, Terry. "Inventing Professional Development Schools", Educational Leadership, vol. 46, November 3, 1988.

Schubert, William H. Curriculum. New York: MacMillan, 1986.

Su, Zhixin. "Teacher Education In The United States, 1890-1986 Occasional Paper No. 3, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington, 1986.

Tyack, David. Turning Points in Educational History. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Pub. Co., 1967.

-------. "Was There Ever A Golden Age of Teaching?", Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 57, No. 2. (May,1987): 171-74.

Wirth, Arthur G. John Dewey as Educator. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Wise, Arthur.E., et al, Effective Teacher Selection: From Recruitment to Retention. Washington, D.C.: The Rand Corporation, 1987.